tion of Ministers? ... (*Interruptions*) . . .

SHRI ALADI ADUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Sir, let the Prime Minister come. That is the healthy convention... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Sir, what is happening? Is he going to introduce all the Ministers or not? Or, are you withdrawing it now?... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: When there is a change in portfolio, no Minister is introduced. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: He was a Minister earlier. He is now in charge of another Ministry.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER): That is why I stopped introducing. (*Interruptions*)

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Question No. 1 Mr. Pachouri.

Teams constituted to assess the work of Literacy Scheme for the Poor

*1. SHRI SURESH PACHOURI: Will the Minister of HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that 21 evaluation teams, comprising the representative of the Central Government, State Governments and non-official members were constituted to assess the working of voluntary agencies in Literacy Scheme for the Poor;

(b) if so, whether these teams have concluded that the work of only 27 agencies was satisfactory, the work of remaining agencies was unsatisfactory and the bonafides of a number of agencies were also doubtful; and

(c) if so, what were the main points mentioned in the Study Report and what steps are being taken by Government to implement the suggestions made by the teams?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE IN THE MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRI L. P. SHAHI): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(b) The Joint Evaluation Teams were requested to categories the agencies depending upon their performance as below:—

A — Performance absolutely satisfactory.

B — Performance satisfactory but requires improvement.

C — Performance not satisfactory but bonafides not in doubt.

D — Performance not satisfactory and bonafides could be in doubt.

According to the reports received, the number of agencies in each category was as under:—

A	—	27
B	—	118
C	—	126
D	—	76
Total:		347

(c) The Joint Evaluation Teams have generally found that large number of project officials were untrained/not properly trained, the training programmes have been found to be ineffective, teaching/learning materials were not of uniformly good standard, insufficient lighting arrangements at the centres, laxity in supervision, inadequate monitoring of the working

of Voluntary Agencies by the District level functionaries, poor maintenance of records etc.

On the basis of the reports of Joint Evaluation Teams, regional workshops are being organised to guide the B & C category agencies to remove the deficiencies found in their performance in the field of adult eduaction. It has also been decided that rigorous standards will be applied in initial selection of Voluntary Agencies for entrusting projects under the revised scheme. In the revised scheme, One Supervisor has been envisaged for 8—10 centres instead of 30 centres earlier.

The programme implemented by the Voluntary Agencies will be evaluated by certain specified Institutes of Social Sciences & Research. In addition, both Central Government and State Governments will continue to evaluate the functioning of these agencies as and when considered necessary. Quantum of assistance for training purposes has been liberalised in the Revised Scheme.

श्री सुरेश पचौरी : माननीय सभापति जी, मैं सरकार से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि इन एजेंसीज को सेलेक्ट करने का क्या क्राइटेरिया था और किस सीमा तक इनको वित्तीय और अन्य मदद सरकार की ओर से प्रदान की गई है ? रिपोर्ट के मुताबिक 126 एजेन्सीज का कार्य असंतोषजनक रहा तथा 76 एजेन्सीज का संदेहपूर्ण रहा । मंत्री जी ने अपने उत्तर में बताया है कि प्रोजेक्ट आफिशियल अनट्रेन्ड थे और इन एजेन्सीज की एनएडीक्वेट मानिटरिंग थी । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि सरकार ने इन एजेंसीज के विरुद्ध क्या कार्यवाही की ? मैं आपके माध्यम से यह भी जानना चाहता हूं कि जब सरकार के फण्ड का दुरुपयोग किया गया है और जिस काम के लिए यह सहायता दी गई थी उसके लिए इसका उपयोग नहीं किया गया तो आपने उनके विरुद्ध क्या कार्यवाही की ? क्या सरकार निरक्षरता उन्मूलन कार्यक्रम को इन्हीं एजेंसीज से आगे भी चलाना चाहती है ?

श्री एल० पी० साही : महोदय, जिन एजेंसीज का इवेल्यूएशन किया गया है उनको इवेल्यूएशन टीम ने चार केटेगरीज में पाया है । कुल एजेंसीज 347 थी । पहली केटगरी वह है जिनको अच्छा पाया गया । उनकी परफारमेन्स एक्सेल्लेन्टली सेटिसफैक्टरी पाई गई । इस के बाद सवाल उठता है कि सरकार ने इनको कैसे सेलेक्ट किया । सरकार ने इनको सेलेक्ट करने से पहले इनके संबंध में राज्य सरकार की ओर से जो रिकमन्डेशन आई उस पर विचार किया । जहां तक फण्ड के यूटिलाइजेशन का सवाल है, इनमें 27 ऐसी एजेंसीज पाई गई जिनके क्रिडेंशयल्स डाउटफुल पाये गये । उनको रुपया लौटाने के लिए कहा गया है । अगर वह रुपया लौटाया नहीं जाएगा तो उन पर मुकदमा करके वह पैसा लौटाया जाएगा । जहां तक इस कार्यक्रम को आगे चलाने का सवाल है, यह कोशिश की जा रही है कि ऐसी एजेंसीज जिनकी ट्रेनिंग में कमी पाई गई है उनको ट्रेनिंग की सुविधा अधिक दी जाये । ट्रेनिंग के लिए जरूरत होगी तो इसके लिए और पैसे अधिक लगाए जाएंगे जिसमें कार्यकर्ताओं की ट्रेनिंग अच्छी हो जाये । आगे भी वालेंटरी एजेंसीज के माध्यम से हम इस काम को करना चाहते हैं । आए दिनों में ट्रेनिंग की सुविधा बढ़ाने की बात हम कर रहे हैं ।

श्री सुरेश पचौरी : माननीय सभापति जी, लगभग सात सौ वालेन्टरी एजेंसीज हैं जिन्हें छः करोड़ रुपया प्रदान किया गया है । मैं सरकार से यह जानना चाहता हूं कि किस हद तक यानी कितनी प्रतिशत इन एजेंसीज के माध्यम से निरक्षरता दूर हुई है और इन स्कीम्स के आरम्भ होने पर कितना लक्ष्य प्राप्त किया गया है ? सम्पूर्ण निरक्षरता को दूर करने के लिए क्या आठवीं पंचवर्षीय योजना में कोई कार्यक्रम मंत्रालय की ओर से इंट्रोड्यूस किया जा रहा है ?

श्री एल० पी० साही : अभी तक 23 हजार 20 एडल्ट एजुकेशन सेन्टर्स स्वीकृत हुए थे जिनमें 301 वालेन्टरी एजेंसीज लगी हुई हैं । इनके द्वारा करीब 79 लाख एडल्ट लरनर मार्च 1988 तक

एनरोल्ड हुए हैं । साक्षर बनाने की दिशा में काम हुआ है । 421 वालेन्टरी एजेंसीज अभी फील्ड में 30-6-88 तक थी । इन 421 में से 301 वालेन्टरी एजेंसीज 1987-88 तक एसिस्टेंस पा चुकी है, और आये दिन उनकी स्क्रटनी हो रही है । जो ठीक पाये जायेंगे उनकी स्कीम को आगे सेंक्शन किय जायेगा । जो एवेल्यूएशन टीम है उसके आधार पर हम आगे वालेंटरी एजेंसीज की स्कीम को सेंक्शन करने से पहले उनको ज्यादा अच्छी तरह से और ज्यादा सीवियरली टेस्ट करेंगे ।

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: May I know whether the target of universal education for all will be reached by the end of the century if the present rate of investment is kept up? I would also like to know what is the per capita investment in India at present as compared to the per capita investment in other countries of the world. May I know whether the evaluation monitoring is being conducted strictly, efficiently and effectively? I understand that these valuation reports do not give the truth beacuse many of the evaluation reports are based upon wrong statistics. What steps have been taken by the Government to reorganise, revamp and reorient evaluation and monitoring cells in the country?

SHRI L. P. SHAHI: Sir, the Evaluation Team consists of three persons, one from the State Government, one from the Central Government and the third is an expert on the subject. In future we are planning to engage the institutes engaged in the work of social science and research for our evaluation work.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: What is the per capita investment?

SHRI L. P. SHAHI: Sir, I require notice for that. I have already stated that the expenditure is Rs. 614 lakhs. So far as information about other countries is concerned, I will need notice for that.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Is it not true that per capita expenditure is one of the lowest compared to other countries in the world?

SHRI L. P. SHAHI: Fresh notice is needed for that.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Mr. Chairman, Sir, in principle, involving voluntary agencies in the work of National Literacy Mission is laudable. N. L. M. is just not a programme like any other programme. It is a mission, a movement. Sir, the answer given by the hon. Minister shows that out of a total of 347 voluntary agencies so far assigned the job, as many as 76 are those which have been found to be of doubtful *bona fides*. My feeling is that the procedure or the approach adopted itself leads to the growth of what you many call 'professional' voluntary agencies. The scheme envisages that in order to be eligible for assistance, a particular voluntary agency must at least open a particular number of centres. Here I would pointedly ask the hon. Minister whether he would consider the case or the offer of even, say, five well-meaning teachers of a university who decide to set up one centre with only 30 adult learners, thus rendering yeoman's service instead of considering only those voluntary agencies which get themselves registered and then go to the State Administration for grants. Will the preference not be given to the small but committed voluntary agencies? Secondly, the reply of the Minister says that there is one Supervisor who looks after the work of 8—10 centres. It looks quite all right on paper. If my information is correct, the Supervisor is also given the work of motivation and he gets an honorarium of only Rs. 300/-. Would it be sufficient for motivating him to devote time and undertake such a gigantic work? Would he not do only some paper work for this honorarium of Rs. 300/- which he gets?

SHRI L. P. SHAHI: The question of bringing down the number of centres attached to a particular agency was also brought up for discussion in the last meeting of the General Council of the N.L.M. held only a few days back and this is under consideration of the Government. So far as payment to the supervisor is concerned, the whole scheme envisages that we are not going to have whole-time Government servants for this work. But they are also to be treated as on a voluntary basis. That is why the question of payment *vis-a-vis* whole-time Government servant has not been in mind at any time, during the conceptual stage as well as now.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, my question will be in three parts: Firstly, I would like to know the average number of years during which the 126 and 76 organisations have been working because it has got a relation with the performance. We have been aiming to have universalisation of elementary education by the end of the century. I would like to know as to what has been the average number of years of these two categories of institutions because if we have to correct it, we will have to take corrective steps depending upon the number of years and the efforts that have been wasted. Secondly, he has said that he will be having the performance of the organisation evaluated by a noted institution of Social Sciences. I would like to know categorically from him as to what will be the time-frame for this evaluation to be done by the Institute of Social Sciences in view of the urgency of the task which you have set for ourselves to attain the universalisation of elementary education. Thirdly, what has been the mechanism so far to find out whether a particular voluntary organisation has been working or not? If there has been a mechanism, why was that mechanism not utilised to detect the non-functioning of those institutions whose *bona fides* are even doubled and have been allowed to function for so many years? Therefore, if there was no mechanism, why was the Government not thinking in terms of evolving a mechanism by which the performance of the voluntary organisations functioning in this field could be evaluated?

SHRI L. P. SHAHI: So far as the mechanism is concerned, I have already stated in the statement laid on the Table that we have found that the District unit has also to be strengthened. They were not monitoring to the extent which was expected of them. And that has come to our light and we are trying to improve the District unit for selection of new agencies as well as for monitoring the working of the present agencies. That is so far as the District unit is concerned. So far as the information which the hon. Member wants to know is concerned as to how many of these 347 had been working and since how long they had been working, I have some difficulty in putting it that way just now. I may circulate it for the information of the hon. Member. But, from 1982-83, we started with 133 voluntary agencies, and gradually we have come from 133 to 257, then to 284, then to 368. Like that we have come, and yearwise we have progressed. I have not with me just now that figure which he wanted. Well, I will obtain it and send it to the hon. Member.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: What about the time-frame for evaluation by the Institute of Social Sciences?

SHRI L. P. SHAHI: The Institute of Social Sciences and some University departments in Social Sciences are working. There are certain independent autonomous institutions. There are certain other types of institutions in the country. But they are not uniformly available in every State and every part. That is why we think that wherever they are available, we will use their expertise to evaluate.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: What about time-frame?

SHRI L. P. SHAHI: That is concurrent. That will go side by side.

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY: Sir, I would like to put my supplementary segregating it into three parts. Sir, information has been given in the statement about 347 voluntary organisations. I would like to know from the hon. Minister (a) if it could be possible for him to give the State-wise break-up of all these organisations (b) coverage by each of these organisations in the last three years, and (c) whether there is any scheme introduced by the Government to provide opportunities to those who intend to pursue their studies further after they attended the adult education centres.

SHRI L. P. SHAHI: Sir, so far as the statewise figures are concerned I will get it circulated if the Hon. Member so desires. I do not have the State-wise figures just now. But so far as pursuing further the State-wise list is concerned. . . . (व्यवधान) स्टेटवाइज लिस्ट है तो पढ़ने में बहुत समय लगेगा।

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is what I said, it will take a long time.

आप टेबल पर रख देंगे ?

SHRI L. P. SHAHI: Yes, I will place it on the Table of the House. So far as the revised scheme under NLM is concerned, we have envisaged

"साक्षरता अभियान"

three stages, literacy programme in three stages. It is not based on months or number of days. It is based on hours spent and that is in three stages, two are refresher and the first is elementary. Altogether 600, 200 and 200 at intervals. Then we think that it has been completed so that it does not relapse.

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY: What about the coverage after one year of their study? Sir, I told you in reality that the children of the age group of 12, 14 and 16 are taught in adult education centres. You won't come across very elderly people in these centres, if you visit these centres. They are taught for just one year and impetus is given to them, some inspiration is given to them and a kind of desire is instilled in them to study further but once the course is completed they do not know where to go and how to learn further. What is the scheme actually formulated by the Government to fulfil their aspirations? I want to know this thing specifically from the Hon. Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any follow-up scheme?

SHRI L. P. SHAHI: This is meant for the people in the age group of 15 to 35. There may be some dropouts from school to which the hon. Member is referring. I do not categorically say that somebody below the age of 15 had certainly not been entered anywhere. That may be possible. Some people may be there. But this is meant for the people in the age group of 15 to 35 years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Fifteen years is not an adult.

SHRI L. P. SHAHI: For purposes of adult literacy, we take people in the group of 15 and 35 years. Many people are working somewhere in the field of factory or on farms and they come at odd hours only to make themselves literate so that they may get some promotion, or things like that, where they are working.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: In the statement laid on the Table of the House, it has been said that 202 centres are unsatisfactorily run or are run by organisations whose bona fide are in doubt. So only 105 centres remain. But the second category is of those whose training is incomplete. My question is whether in order to fulfil the target of achieving literacy for all these categories of people, who are not served by the present scheme some alternative scheme would be evolved by involving teachers of all stages and students in the field of higher education.

SHRI L. P. SHAHI: Sir, that matter was raised in the meeting of the Council held only a few days ago and that is under consideration as to how we should involve teachers and students in this work.

डा० जगन्नाथ मिश्र : सभापति महोदय, मंत्री जी से मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि मूल्यांकन समिति ने जो वर्गीकरण किया है, उस वर्गीकरण मे स्पष्ट है कि स्वैच्छिक इकाइयों को जो पैसे दिए गए हैं, उन पैसों का दुरुपयोग हुआ है । उत्तर में जैसा कहा गया है कि केटेगरी "ए" में जो पूर्ण रूप से संतोषप्रद है, वह केवल 27 संस्थायें हैं 347 में से, और केटेगरी "ग" के उत्तर मे आपने कहा कि मुख्य कारण है कि प्रशिक्षण नहीं है, व्यवस्था नहीं है, जो शिक्षण के कार्य होने चाहिएं, वह अच्छे स्तर के नही हैं, ऐसी परिस्थिति में प्रारम्भ मे सरकार ने क्या सोचा था इन स्वैच्छिक संस्थाओं को जिम्मेदारियां देने के लिए ? अगर उन्हें पूर्व से शर्तें मालूम थीं, उन शर्तों को उन्होंने पूरा नहीं किया तो फिर उन्हें यह अनुदान क्यों दिया गया ? सरकार ने कोई मापदंड पहले से निर्धारित कर रखा था या नहीं ? यह सार्वजनिक रुपए का अपव्यय करने का क्या औचित्य हो सकता है ? जांच-पड़ताल किए बिना ऐसी संस्थाओ को, ऐसे केन्द्रों को चलाने की अनुमति क्यों दी गई ? जब यह कार्यान्वयन समिति ने स्पष्ट त्रुटिया बताई तो सरकार बताए कि इन त्रुटियों को दूर करने के उनके कारगर कदम क्या है ? केवल मात्र पैसे वापस लेना या उन पर कार्यवाही करना पर्याप्त नही होगा । जो संस्थाये कार्यरत हैं, उनमें से अधिकांश संस्थाओं का कार्य असंतोषप्र है क्योंकि आपके उत्तर के अनुसार संतोषजनक श्रेणी में केवल 27 संस्थायें ही हैं, जिनके नाम दर्ज है, बाकी सभी संस्थाओं का कार्य असंतोषप्रद है । सरकार उनके बारे में क्या उपाय करेगी कि जिन संस्थाओं के कार्य आर्थिक रूप से पूर्ण रूप से असंतोषप्रद है, उनके दोष दूर किए जायं ।

श्री एल० पी० साही : महोदय, मैंने पूर्व में ही अर्ज किया है कि इन संस्थाओं का चुनाव राज्य-सरकारों की अनुशंसा उनकी मार्फत आने के बाद हुआ था और अगर आप इसको गौर से देखेंगे तो जिन 76 संस्थाओं के बारे में कहा गया है कि अनसेटसफैक्टरी है और उनके बोनाफाइडस भी डाउटफुल हैं, हम लोगों ने उनको प्रेक्टीकल एग्जामिन किया है और उन 76 संस्थाओं में 27 ऐसी देखी हैं, जिनके बोनाफाइडस के बारे मे है । जिन संस्थाओं के काम में इंप्रूवमेंट की जरूरत है, उनमें मैं यह मानता हूं कि उनको ट्रेनिंग देकर या उनको कुछ बताकर उनका काम इम्प्रूव किया जा सकता है । केवल 27 ही ऐसी संस्थायें निकली है, जिनके बोनाफाइडस भी डाउटफुल हैं तो उनसे पैसे लौटाने की कार्यवाही की है ।

*2. [*The questioner (Shri Ram Jethmalani was absent. For answer vide Col. 31 infra.*]

Partial Privatisation of the Airlines

*3. DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI:†
SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA:

Will the Minister of CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM be pleased to state:

(a) whether a Special Experts' Committee appointed by the Planning Commission, has suggested partial privatisation of the national Airlines for the development of tourism in the country;

(b) if so, what are the names of the experts and salient features of the recommendations made by the Committee, stating the considerations on which partial privatisation of the airlines has been recommended; and

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Dr. Yelamanchili Sivaji.